

However, to do this we need to be able to justify the use of archaeology as a good educational discipline and, moreover, to introduce it as an appropriate discipline to administrators whose own knowledge of archaeology is highly subjective. Those who have taught in schools know which 'buzz words' archaeologists must employ to make archaeology 'relevant' to education today, words which will provide some ammunition for headteachers trying to make their own justification to a Local Education Authority. I spent a term, two afternoons a week, team-teaching a class of 60 nine year-olds with two teachers who had no knowledge of archaeology. This was an exercise in introducing archaeology into a school where there was no formal expertise or tradition of archaeology. By the end of term the children had dealt with time, measured buildings, had a garbage project, constructed archaeological sites and excavated them, done a site survey on a motte and bailey castle, learnt to draw whole pots from a single sherd and to describe and identify them, done a graveyard survey, had a competition for noting and making a vocabulary of windows and learnt to spell romanesque!

Archaeology ranked next to football as their favourite activity and most of the girls put it first. No-one in that class can have remained ignorant of what archaeologists do, the value of archaeology or the complexity of its techniques. All of them got a great deal out of it, both personally and in terms of understanding society. The educational techniques of measuring, recording and drawing were being used all the time as well as the children's ability to observe, comprehend and discuss the material world. Moreover it suited children of a wide ability range because of the practical input, in a way that merely knowing about prehistory or history, with their emphasis on academic skills of reading and writing, do not. The experience convinced me that the study of archaeology has a high value as an education in itself.

I have not in this short paper dealt with the value of archaeology as a tool for explaining the past so that society can have a past beyond the events of documented history. The past can be presented by a few archaeologists for the benefit of the whole society, without that society having too much idea of how their past was constructed. In effect this is what happens now and we can see only too clearly how archaeology and archaeologists are valued as a result. We see it too, as I suggested at the start of this paper, reflected in archaeologists' own valuation of themselves. Only through a more widely educated public can we hope to have a society which values archaeology as a resource and as a discipline, and that educated public can only come if, as archaeologists, we can convince society of the value of archaeology as education.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND ITS PLACE IN THE PRIMARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Jonathan Kissock

Introduction

Archaeologists are paying more and more attention to public perceptions of their discipline and to the role of the subject in society. Part of the debate over these issues relates to archaeology and its place in education. If archaeologists are to play a full part in this debate, it is necessary for them to be familiar with the aims and objectives of the primary school curriculum and with the teaching style now favoured by primary school teachers. This paper discusses these themes and attempts to explore why archaeology should, and how archaeology ought, to be taught in the primary school. It briefly examines the nature of historical interpretation and how this relates to contemporary teaching methods; it also considers the place of archaeological work -- including field and experimental projects -- and the value of a knowledge of prehistory within the general educational framework given to every schoolchild.

Children spend the most important years of their school life, those between the ages of seven and eleven, in primary schools. Here they acquire and develop basic literacy and numeracy skills and for the first time are exposed to a wide range of academic experiences. Hence, it is in primary schools that the foundations of all future education are laid. Primary school curricula have changed considerably over the last two decades with a child-centred, discovery-based approach replacing the teacher-focused didactic one. Primary education is now geared towards the teaching of skills. Teachers have firmly accepted a skills approach, within which they aim to develop their pupils' level of competence, rather than provide them with a store of truths. A skills approach to primary education is concerned less with the stock of factual information children acquire than with the ability of children to find out these truths for themselves, and their capacity to use and organise this stock once discovered. In other words, teachers are enabling their pupils to learn how to do something. Hence, children should be taught the past by learning how to find out about it, rather than simply by learning facts about the past.

Historical Interpretation and the Skills Approach to Learning

The past is speculative, its interpretation cannot be value-free. As the intermediary between historical sources of whatever kind and his or her pupils, the teacher can only present his or her own interpretation of these sources to them. E.H. Carr has stated:

The historian is an individual human being. Like other individuals he (*sic*) is also a social phenomenon, both the product and the conscious or unconscious spokesman of the society to which he belongs; it is in this capacity that he approaches the historical past (1961, 29).

Similarly, Ian Hodder has commented that "the theories one espouses about the past depend much on one's own social and cultural context" (1986, 16). All too often the teachers' opinions will be white, middle-class and Christian-based, and thus divorced from the real-life experiences of many children. Pupils must be encouraged to form their own opinions about the past. This can only be done by teaching them the skills, giving them the insights and helping them to develop ways in which they might understand the nature of evidence about the past.

There has been an attack on the skills approach to teaching history in the last few months. One contributor to this debate, Alan Beattie, has written (1987, 22-3):

History -- being essentially a detailed factual story -- ...is eminently appropriate for formal testing of knowledge....Getting things right and acquiring knowledge is an important educational step; one which, incidentally, is a source of satisfaction when the accolade of success is conferred after competition and according to impartial tests. History from this standpoint is eminently suitable.

Any historian worth their salt evaluates the biases of their sources, and Beattie's work is part of the Conservative Party's Centre for Policy Studies's advocacy of educational changes. They are opposed to recent educational developments and would like to see a return to former practices. They believe that many parents support them in their desire to introduce regular testing and 'competition' between schools as to which can produce the best results in these tests. It is argued that there should be no restrictions on which children should go to which schools and that parents should have a free choice, their decision presumably based on the school's test results.

Beattie argues that children should be taught just the 'whens' and the 'whos' of history. He proposes that children should be given a basic grounding in history uncomplicated by attempts to handle prejudices of historians and the biases of received assumptions. As far as Beattie is concerned, "the past is, of course, independent of us; it has happened, it's dead, and only Dr. Who can change it" (1987, 9). This is simply not so. There is no independent past. Turning once more to E.H. Carr:

The historian without his (*sic*) facts is rootless and futile; the facts without their historian are dead and meaningless. My first answer therefore to the

question "what is history?" is that it is a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the past and the present (1961, 24).

This interdependence of fact and interpretation can be seen in a brief examination of one example: Stonehenge. Fact: Stonehenge is a monument built and re-built from large stones, between 5000 and 3000 years ago. Archaeologists begin to interpret this structure through the use of concepts such as 'Neolithic', 'megalithic' and 'years BC'. Interpretation is, of course, taken further than this. To 16th century antiquarians Stonehenge was built by giants or had been raised through the magic of Merlin; the more discerning Victorians considered it as a centre for religion and ritual; and in the contemporary Space Age some have perceived it as an astronomical observatory. As Jacquetta Hawkes once wrote, "every age has the Stonehenge it deserves -- or desires" (1967, 174).

It is simply not possible to reconcile Beattie's views, and those of like-minded politicians and educationalists, with established historical (and archaeological) premises about the nature of the historical process.

Before examining the contribution that archaeology can make to a curriculum which aims to teach skills it is perhaps necessary to expand upon what educationalists consider the skills-based approach to encompass. Geva Blenkin and Vic Kelly (1981) list four types of skills learning that occur largely in schools and which are essential to the teaching that goes on there. First come the basic skills of literacy and numeracy; young children will spend most of their time at school acquiring and polishing these essential skills. Second are the specialist skills which are taught as part of other curriculum activities -- the skills of the artist, the scientist or the historian, for example. The third type of skill is that of critical thinking; this stage comprises the identification of new problems and then deciding which of the second type of skill is appropriate for solving these problems. Finally there are the social skills, for example those of partnership and co-operation. Every well thought out and carefully balanced curriculum should aim to develop all these skills. Here, however, the emphasis is on the teaching of specialist skills -- those skills used by archaeologists, i.e. skills which will help children to master certain historical concepts.

Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education (1985) have identified certain concepts as being essential elements in good history teaching across the age range from five to sixteen. The concepts are an awareness of the nature of evidence, an appreciation of change and continuity, an understanding of cause and effect, the development of historical empathy (defined as informed appreciation of the predicaments, attitudes and beliefs of others in the past), the extension of a sense of chronology and time, and the development of the ability to pose

historical questions. Archaeology can play a valuable role in helping children to discover these skills.

Archaeology in the Curriculum

This paper argues that teaching ought to be centred around making children aware of the nature of the evidence and helping them to draw their own conclusions from that evidence. This is the only way in which history can be taught. The other concepts regarded by Her Majesty's Inspectors as being important -- for example, the ability to pose historical questions -- will not be ignored. The awareness of the nature of evidence cannot be separated from other concepts; all the concepts ought, as far as possible, to be taught together. The list of desired skills cannot be placed alongside a list of archaeological topics, each to be taught with the desired aim of introducing a specific skill. There will, of course, be considerable overlap. One topic may introduce several skills. Furthermore, skills are not learnt only once and then added to a general skills repertoire to be drawn on as needed, they have to be reinforced and developed through the study of several topics throughout the years of primary education. The organisation of this requires the careful planning of the curriculum. One way of organising this work is through a series of topics or projects, each of which is studied intensively for a short period of time. It is now common in many primary schools to take three topics and to study them in detail for one term each; one of these projects is usually scientific, a second geographical and the third historical. In this way one period of history would be selected as the topic and then examined in detail. This way of organising work is sometimes referred to as the "patch approach" (Waters 1982).

Archaeological evidence is mainly material and therein lies its value when used in schools. To a young child, the 1960s are, in many respects, as remote as the Palaeolithic. The use of material objects in teaching provides something tangible and concrete which will help the children to conceptualise something of the passage of time. Time is in itself a very difficult concept: it is relative and is therefore measured and perceived in many different ways depending on the positions of different societies and individuals (see ARC 6:1).

Material evidence has been used to initiate many historical projects. Shirley Echlin (1982) started an Infants' School project on 'the Romans' with an examination of Roman Pottery. Joan Blyth (1978) used more recent objects -- Great War memorabilia and a Victorian wedding dress -- to help a small group of six year old children to come to terms with age and change over time. An appreciation of change could be built up, as far as it is possible, through a seriation exercise. It would be ridiculous to expect children to emulate the typologies favoured by previous generations of archaeologists. However, a simple exercise using flint tools (some flaked, others polished), early metal tools and more recent hand- and electrically-powered ones could have interesting results if conducted by a well-informed teacher, sensitive to the nature of historical interpretation. There is a danger with this

type of exercise: that an emphasis on 'progress' and its consequent advantages is not tempered by reference to the disadvantages which may accompany it. Nevertheless, it is important that children should handle primary sources: the importance of direct access to the evidence cannot be over-stressed. Material-based studies have an inherent advantage over document-based ones; in the latter it is rare for a child to be allowed to study a document in anything other than facsimile or xerox form. Archaeological material is an ideal medium for teaching concepts such as awareness of change -- identified by Her Majesty's Inspectors as of crucial importance -- because children, who can be safely allowed to handle many categories of artefact, will find it easier to make imaginative leaps when confronted with real objects from the past.

The Importance of Practical Experience

Ideally, junior school children should be able to undertake some fieldwork of their own; this will help them understand how archaeologists gather their data. Rest assured: I do not envisage hordes of children, all armed with trowels, attacking the nation's monuments. Fieldwork by children must be restricted to either repeatable activities or to those which investigate nothing of archaeological significance. Although the substance of the children's work is very unlikely to be of importance, it cannot be presented as such to the children; devaluing their activities would be unfair.

However, we should not ignore the consequences of practical concerns and perhaps even more importantly, the fundamental implications of national and local government attitudes to education other than those already discussed. In recent years there has been a real reduction in the amount spent by local authorities on the education of children (for example, see Passmore 1984 for a discussion of the recent reduction in the size of education budgets of £100 million per annum). Many schools now have to rely entirely on parental contributions to finance trips and excursions; in some areas of the country parents are becoming increasingly unwilling, and even unable, to make these contributions. A dangerous situation could develop: some children might, thanks to their parents' affluence, receive extra-mural instruction and experience (including the skills-based archaeology teaching advocated here) whilst others -- those from poorer families -- might easily be denied such experience on the basis of parental income.

An example of fieldwork which was important to the children, but did no harm to anything of archaeological importance, took place during an 'archaeological week' at Great Wilbraham School, Cambridge, in June 1984. This was organised by Gill Heyworth (now Education Officer for the Council for British Archaeology) and myself. A party of 32 children, aged between nine and eleven, were taken to visit the excavations at Haddenham (undertaken by the Department of Archaeology in Cambridge). The children were divided into two groups; each ate lunch at a separate location around a camp fire among the spoil heaps. They threw their litter everywhere (the only school trip where this was encouraged?) and finally buried the remains. The groups swapped

locations and, with the help of the excavation staff, 'excavated' and planned these 'sites'. Finally, they were encouraged to make deductions about the seating plans (deliberately kept different) at both locations.

I made a return trip to Haddenham in May 1986 with a party of 11 and 12 year old children from Glebe House School, Hunstanton. I feel that these children gained much less of an idea about what archaeology involves and about how archaeologists recover their evidence. This second party of children only viewed the excavations and did no work of their own. They found it almost impossible to envisage how archaeologists could interpret artefact distributions and soil colour changes. The children from Great Wilbraham did not have these problems -- they could understand what the archaeologists were trying to do because they had a little experience of what it was like to be archaeologists. Visits to excavations by groups of children can easily prove a disappointment; they expect excitement -- in the form of several gold brooches and a couple of skeletons (brutally murdered) -- but rarely find it.

Fieldwork is, of course, much more than excavation. The children of Great Wilbraham School also tried fieldwalking. They found very little in the way of conventional archaeological material -- this should not be taken to indicate that there was nothing there -- but they did collect virtually enough spare parts to build their own tractor! Paul Noble (1984) suggests that a hedge dating survey is a suitable activity for children, although this work is nowhere near as simple and straightforward as has been previously believed (Muir and Muir 1987). A range of other activities are possible with junior school children; I note here merely a few examples from this range. Frances Dale (1982a) enlisted the help of a professional archaeologist and took a class of children from Duxford Church of England Primary School, Cambridge, to plan a moated site. Brian Dix and Richard Smart (1982) used children to carry out a graveyard survey. It is now possible to input the results of such work into a computer and to use it as a historical data base within the classroom. Fieldwork is much more rewarding than just visiting excavations because it is not abstract, but concerned with real things from the past. An appreciation of how archaeologists -- and, indeed, how many professionals -- work is something that all children should experience. If children are to be asked to use (archaeological) evidence to construct historical concepts for themselves, they must understand the nature of the evidence and how this affects the reliability of judgements made from that evidence.

The Particular Value of Experimental Archaeology

Primary school children have also been involved in experimental archaeology projects. These help develop children's sense of historical empathy. They take children beyond handling the evidence, and allow them to try to make their own versions of it. Experimental archaeological projects will also help children develop the skill of posing questions and trying to develop methods to answer them. The Department of Education and Science is advocating more technical education in

schools; whilst this is not what they probably had in mind, such projects would certainly be a step in this direction. Frances Dale (1982b) has carried out a series of projects with a class using wool; it has been cleaned, combed, spun, dyed and finally woven. John Steane's secondary school pupils built and used kilns and also smelted iron (Steane 1986). There are simpler ideas which can be followed. As part of a study of the Iron Age I made coil pots and simple fibulae brooches with a class of eleven year olds. Through very basic activities -- rolling out pottery clay and twisting lengths of wire -- the pupils discovered two ways in which things could have been made in the past.

Experimental archaeology can also be used to explore cooking, currently in vogue in the primary school due to the contribution it makes to children's measuring, manipulative and co-operative skills. Apicius's recipes can be tried (Flowers and Rosenbaum 1958); however a visit from the RSPCA will certainly follow if the children are asked to prepare stuffed dormice! The subject of cookery also demonstrates which archaeologists fall foul of sexist language. James Dyer has written of a potential series of experiments, noting that "girls in particular may like to try a cooking pit" (1983, 45). A recent Council for British Archaeology report (Cracknell and Corbishley 1986) has as its theme presenting archaeology to young people and has on its cover a girl working at a quern, whilst a boy is recording gravestones. This is a regrettable choice of illustrations. Another potentially worrying problem which could develop through the use of experimental archaeology is that of attitudes towards 'primitiveness'. Teachers might worry that children will come to think that because they are making something less sophisticated than the similar objects they use in everyday life they may come to over-simplify the complexity of past societies and to regard all past life as 'primitive'. In reality, I have found that the opposite often happens: children realise how much work goes into making something, and thus they come to respect past craftsmanship.

The Importance of Teaching Archaeology and Prehistory

Throughout this paper, one important theme has been implicit: archaeology is worth teaching in the primary school. This attitude has not been questioned. So far, the way in which archaeology should be taught has been considered, but not whether or not it ought to be taught at all. If we simply want to teach children how to gather evidence and use it to solve problems, couldn't we use Sherlock Holmes -- or even Glyn Daniel -- novels? In the fullness of time, Glyn Daniel and Mortimer Wheeler will hopefully be remembered for the major role they played in popularising archaeology through television programmes such as "Animal, Vegetable or Mineral?" and "Buried Treasure". They stripped the discipline of much of its academic mystique and brought it into the wider public consciousness. Many people now take the opportunity to visit sites, read various publications on archaeological themes, attend lectures given by university extra-mural departments, local societies and the Workers Educational Association.

'Heritage', as it is now termed, is an important activity to many people. English Heritage now has over 112,000 members, this compares with nearly 50,000 in 1985 and just 3000 when it was the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Directorate of the Department of the Environment prior to 1984. This rapid growth in membership is a testament to the interest which the public have in their past. Societies with interests in particular periods or themes have also seen their membership lists rise dramatically in recent years. The largest group is now the National Trust: its 1.4 million members (double the 1977 figure) enjoy free entry to its historic houses and gardens throughout England and Wales. There is obviously, then, a large body of people who express an interest in, and are prepared to pay membership subscriptions to join, bodies concerned with preserving the past.

If teachers fail to introduce archaeology into their curriculum planning, they are failing to equip their pupils for what is becoming a major leisure pursuit. Archaeology, whilst growing in popularity, will, however, only be pursued by a minority of pupils. This should not deter teachers from tackling it. Archaeology, and the prehistoric and historic past which the discipline reveals, should be taught to all pupils for two reasons. First, prehistory provides the only evidence for some of the major changes that have occurred in the human past. Second, the study of prehistory can make a valuable contribution to multicultural education.

The archaeological study of prehistory has provided the only evidence for human expansion from southern and eastern Africa to the rest of the world. Archaeology also provides the only evidence for the development of agriculture and of 'civilisation' and the bureaucratic state. Everybody now lives in this type of society (with the possible exception of remote groups whose lives are nonetheless profoundly influenced by 'civilisation'). Archaeology also demonstrates the unity of humankind, and therefore provides material which ought to be incorporated into schemes of multicultural education. Multicultural, and especially anti-racist, education are relatively recent developments, yet the potential of archaeology for developing rational attitudes was recognised some decades ago. J.G.D. Clark (1943) states that it is only by establishing a sense of unity that humanity will move forward into a life of elementary decency. This sense of unity and human solidarity will only come from conscious knowledge of common human origins. His views were echoed by Miles Burkitt (1955) when discussing the tensions and rivalries which existed in Africa. Burkitt believed that archaeology would provide a focus around which the African peoples could rally. This focus would be the land in which they lived, its past and hence its future well-being.

Conclusions

A knowledge of the ways in which archaeology should be taught, and the reasons why it ought to be taught in primary schools are important for both teachers and archaeologists. If archaeology is to be taught successfully in schools, co-operation between both groups of

professionals is necessary. Each has to understand what the other is doing and be sympathetic to the other's aims and objectives. If teachers are able to follow the sort of curriculum outlined above, they will need considerable assistance from archaeologists, in terms of specialist advice, the loan of materials and access to excavations. If archaeologists are invited into schools they need to be made aware of the child-centred nature of modern primary education; the direct, didactic approach has been replaced by teaching through discovery. If archaeology is to be used to help children to construct their own models of past societies and to assist children to use these models constructively, both teachers and archaeologists must communicate, co-operate and aim for mutual understanding.

The vital importance of the subject matter and the considerable interest people show in their past makes archaeology a subject which ought to be taught to every child in every school. Archaeologists have an active and crucial role to play in the teaching of their discipline. At the moment, a visit by a practising archaeologist is a rare event -- more ought to be done to encourage teachers to invite archaeologists into the classroom. Following the lead of the Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust and others, archaeological units could begin by offering their services to schools. Archaeologists, when working with children in school or in the field, must be sympathetic to the skills based approach; they should not offer a dry account of 'whos' and 'whens', but instead should concentrate on the 'hows' and 'whys' of archaeological investigation.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the Headteachers of Great Wilbraham Church of England Primary School, Cambridgeshire, Sketty Primary School, Swansea, and Glebe House School, Hunstanton, Norfolk, for assistance in projects described in this article. I am grateful to Nigel Holman and Gill Heyworth who read earlier drafts of this article. Responsibility for any remaining mistakes rests with the author.

References

- Beattie, A. 1987. History in Peril: May Parents Preserve It. London, Centre for Policy Studies.
- Blenkin, G. and Kelly, A. 1981. The Primary Curriculum. London, Harper and Row.
- Blyth, J. 1978. Young children and the past. Teaching History 21, 15-29.
- Burkitt, M. 1955. Archaeology and education. Paper read at the Third Pan-African Archaeological Congress.
- Carr, E.H. 1961. What is History?: The G.M. Trevelyan Lectures Delivered in the University of Cambridge. London, Macmillan.
- Clark, J.G.D. 1943. Education and the study of man. Antiquity 17, 113-121.

- Cracknell, S. and Corbishley, M. 1986. Presenting Archaeology to Young People. C.B.A. Research Report 64. London, Council for British Archaeology.
- Dale, F. 1982a. Archaeology at Duxford Primary School. In Dale, F. (ed.) Archaeology in the Primary School. London, Council for British Archaeology, 4-15.
- Dale, F. 1982b. Using wool. In Dale, F. (ed.) Archaeology in the Primary School. London, Council for British Archaeology, 18-22.
- Dix, B. and Smart, R. 1982. Down among the deadmen. In Corbishley, M. (ed.) Archaeology in the Town. London, Council for British Archaeology.
- Dyer, J. 1983. Teaching Archaeology in Schools. Princes Risborough, Shire.
- Echlin, S. 1982. Archaeology in the infants school. In Dale, F. (ed.) Archaeology in the Primary School. London, Council for British Archaeology, 2-3.
- Flowers, B. and Rosenbaum, E. 1958. Apicus: The Roman Cookery Book. London, Harrap.
- Hawkes, J. 1967. God in the machine. Antiquity 41, 174-80.
- Hodder, I. 1987. Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education. 1985. History in the Primary and Secondary Years. London, Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Muir, R. and Muir, N. 1987. Hedgerows: Their History and Wildlife. London, Michael Joseph.
- Noble, P. 1985. Curriculum Planning in the Primary School. Historical Association Teaching of History Series 57. London, Historical Association.
- Passmore, B. 1984. Analysis of the annual estimates of local authority spending produced by CIPFA. Times Educational Supplement, 5th October, p. 6.
- Steane, J. 1986. Experimental archaeology. In Cracknell, S. and Corbishley, M. 1986. Presenting Archaeology to Young People. C.B.A. Research Report 64. London, Council for British Archaeology, 33-7.
- Waters, D. 1982. Primary School Projects: Planning and Developments. London, Heinemann Educational.

A CHILD'S EYE VIEW OF THE PAST

Kathv Emmott

The past is what all people build their present and future on (Garrison 1986, 1).

The foundations of our images of the past are laid down in childhood, with education and media presentation creating initial and perhaps lasting impressions. If, as Garrison states, these perceptions have such a fundamental influence on attitudes to the present, it is important to explore children's conceptions of the past and the factors which influence these conceptions. How do children conceive of the past and its people? Do education and media presentations shape opinions to a greater or lesser extent? Has teaching about the past changed, particularly in relation to the inclusion of more work on other countries and cultures? These are some of the questions that the survey on which this article is based sought to answer.

The survey, undertaken by members of the 'Archaeology and Education' team based at Southampton University, involved 117 children in the 10-12 age group from six classes in six schools in Southampton. The sample included schools in working class and middle class areas of the city with varying proportions of ethnic minority children. 91% were born in Britain. 66% were 'British' (ie. white, Anglo-Saxon) and 22% were 'Asian' (including children from India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Kenya and Mauritius). There were also small numbers of Greek Cypriots (3.4%), others from Africa and the Caribbean (2.5%), 2.5% from Arab countries (Iraq, Saudi Arabia the Lebanon) and one individual from Iran. 4% were of mixed race.

All of the classes had some 'ethnic minority' children, but one school was predominantly 'British' (87%) while another had a high proportion of 'Asian' children (83%).¹ This variation of ethnic composition made it possible to assess whether the presence of 'ethnic minority' children affected the content of the curriculum. Only 12% of the parents of those children included in the sample agreed to be interviewed so I have included some of their comments, but no statistics associated with this part of the survey. The interviews took place at school and were based on a questionnaire, which the interviewer completed from the child's responses. Every attempt was made to put the children at their ease during the interviews.

Findings of the Survey: What is History?

Time, especially when measured in thousands of years, is a difficult concept for adults, let alone children, to grasp. Children of